



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VARIA.

I. Among the fragments of Korinna, in Bergk's collection, is one (No. 20) which that scholar has dealt with in the most capricious way, making it almost unintelligible. It reads thus in his edition :

*Κλία γέροντ' ἀϊσομένα
Ταναγρίδεσσι λευκοπέπλους·
μέγα δ' ἐμῆς γέγασε πόλις
λιγουροχωτίλης ἐνόπης.*

To obtain this text he has substituted *κλία* for *καλά*, *γέροντ'* for *γέροια*, *ἀϊσομένα* for *εἰσομένα*, *λευκοπέπλους* (with Ahrens) for *λευκοπέπλοις*, *ἐμῆς* (with Boeckh) for *ἐμῇ*, *γέγασε* for *γέγαυε* and *ἐνόπης* (with Boeckh) for *ἐνοπῆς*. One wonders that he did not throw away the old fragment and write a new verse altogether. He might then have made it intelligible and filled it with Ahrensian forms to his heart's content. The only real difficulty in the whole passage lies in the second word, which conjecture has read variously, *γέροια*, *γέρεια*, *γεργή*, *Γέρωι*, *γέροντ'*. Why it should have been assumed to be a noun is not plain, especially as the *δέ* in the second clause almost implies a verb in the first. The true reading seems to have been *γέραιρ' ἀεισομέναν*, which being falsely divided, *γέραιρα εἰσομένα*, became unintelligible, and caused the further alterations. Dropping most of Bergk's conjectures, we may read :

*Καλὰ γέραιρ' ἀεισομέναν
Ταναγρίδεσσι λευκοπέπλοις,
μέγα δ' ἐμῇ γέγαυε πόλις
λιγουροχωτίλης ἐνοπῆς.*

Here *ν* has been added to *ἀεισομέναν* and *ς* dropped from *πόλις*.

Might not the youthful Korinna, at the close of an ode, have bespoken the good graces of her hearers thus?

"Honor the future sweet singer of the white-robed dames of Tanagra, and rejoice, my city, in the clear-plaintive strain."

It is worth while remarking that this passage proves the second *α* in *Τάναγρα*, usually given as long, to have been naturally short.

II. In Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, *A* 7, p. 1072, b 2 (Bekk.) is a passage which has puzzled all the editors, and which yet may be emended with such ease and certainty that one wonders that its

true form should not have struck every one. Speaking of final cause, A. says: ὅτι δ' ἔστι τὸ οὗ ἔνεκα ἐν τοῖς ἀκινήτοις, ἣ διαίρεσις δηλοῖ. ἔστι γὰρ τινι τὸ οὗ ἔνεκα, ὧν τὸ μὲν ἔστι τὸ δ' οὐκ ἔστι. In the last clause the ὧν evidently has no antecedent; consequently Schwegler proposes to substitute διττόν for τινι so as to make the antecedent clause equivalent to ἔστι γὰρ δύο γένη τοῦ οὗ ἔνεκα, which might then be followed by ὧν. For this change he has the support of two passages, De Anima, II 2, p. 415, b 2 sq., τὸ δ' οὗ ἔνεκα διττόν, τὸ μὲν οὗ, τὸ δὲ ψ, and *ibid.* b 20, διττῶς δὲ τὸ οὗ ἔνεκα, τὸ τε οὗ καὶ τὸ ψ. Cf. Physica, II 2, p. 194, a 35. Bonitz, accordingly, approves of Schwegler's reading, although differing with him as to the interpretation of the passage. Nevertheless, the violent change of τινι into διττόν is not necessary, and the same meaning may be obtained and the sentence rendered grammatical in a much simpler way. The Laurentian MS. Ab, which Bonitz, as well as Bekker and Brandis, considers of the highest authority (vid. Preface to Bonitz's *Metaphysica*, p. xv), reads ἔστι γὰρ τινι τὸ οὗ ἔνεκα τινός ὧν, ζ. τ. λ. If after ἔνεκα we insert καὶ, which the scribe omitted, no doubt on account of the final κα of ἔνεκα, we obtain ἔστι γὰρ τινι τὸ οὗ ἔνεκα καὶ τινός, ὧν, ζ. τ. λ., which is plain, intelligible, and good Aristotelian doctrine. The last clause, ὧν τὸ μὲν ἔστι, τὸ δ' οὐκ ἔστι, Bonitz completes by supplying ἐν τοῖς ἀκινήτοις. Abrupt and elliptical as Aristotle's Greek often is, I do not think he ever allows himself any such liberty as this. Nor do I think that by this means we obtain the sense he means to convey. The clause does not seem to me elliptical at all. Aristotle simply says: There are two kinds of final cause, the person or thing for whose sake anything is done, and the object aimed at in doing it. When a physician administers medicine, he does so for the sake of the patient (τινί), who *is*, and with a view to health, which *is not*, that is, is not ἐνεργεία, although it certainly is δυνάμει. But things that have any δυνάμεις are not ἀκίνητα, which is just what Aristotle means.

III. Pausanias, in his Itinerary, I 26, 5 (6), speaking of the Erechtheion, says: Γραφαὶ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τοίχων τοῦ γένους εἰς τῶν Βουταδῶν. καὶ, διπλοῦν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ οἶχημα καὶ ὕδωρ ἔστιν ἐνδόν θαλάσσιον ἐν φρέατι. So the old editions read. Siebelis, Dindorf, and Schubert, not knowing what to do with the second καὶ before ὕδωρ, simply throw it out. Michaelis, who has a wild theory with respect to the Erechtheion to support in defiance of evidence, would read καὶ—διπλοῦν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ οἶχημα—καταβάσιν εἰς τὸ κάτω οἶχημα

καὶ ὕδωρ ἐστὶν ἔνδον ἐν φρέατι (then counting the next four lines a parenthesis) καὶ τριάντης ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ σχῆμα, which, without accounting for the troublesome καὶ (why should he say “Both water and the mark of the trident”), entails a new difficulty in the last ἐστίν. The more cautious Jahn assumes a lacuna after οἶκημα without attempting to fill it. Now, it seems to me, there cannot be any doubt what the missing word was. Herodotus, VIII 55, tells us: Ἔστι ἐν τῇ ἀγροπόλει ταύτῃ Ἐρεχθίδος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγόμενου εἶναι νηὸς ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῃ τε καὶ θάλασσα ἐνι. And we know, from other sources, that the sacred olive was the most important object in the Erechtheion, as being the proof of Athena’s title to the temple and the citadel. It is, therefore, almost incredible that Pausanias should have mentioned the salt-water tank and left the more important sacred olive unnoticed, so that we should be justified in inserting the word ἐλαία before the second καὶ. The sentence would then read: Γραφαὶ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τοίχων τοῦ γένους εἰσὶ τῶν Βουταδῶν, καὶ ἐλαία—διπλοῶν γάρ ἐστι τὸ οἶκημα—καὶ ὕδωρ ἐστὶν ἔνδον θαλάσσιον ἐν φρέατι. This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that when further on (27, 2) he speaks of the olive, he alludes to it as if he had already mentioned it: Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐλαίας οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν ἄλλο εἰπεῖν κ. τ. λ. There is great hesitancy among archaeologists to admit that the olive was within the ναός; but there ought to be no doubt on the matter.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.